

21. (Not Amended Herein) An image processing system according to
Claim 13, wherein said at least one input means includes an interface section for
connecting to a computer or a facsimile apparatus.

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the
above-mentioned Official Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following
remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 21 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, and 13
are the only independent claims present in the application. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, and 15
have been amended to even more succinctly define the invention and/or to improve their
form. Support for these amendments can be found at least at pages 12 through 14 and
Figures 1 and 3 through 6 of the specification. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that
no new matter has been added.

Claims 1 through 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious
over previously-cited and -applied Farrell, et al. in view of newly-cited U.S. Patent No.
6,088,550 (Asai, et al.). The rejection respectfully is traversed.

Each of Claims 1, 7, and 13 variously recites dividing image processing of
one image processing unit into *an image input job*, in which image data is input from the
image input section (or image input means, as recited in Claim 7 and 13), and an image
output job. Image data obtained by reading an original image *and* image data received
from an external unit are input in *the image input job* (as recited in Claims 1 and 7), or

image input means inputs image data obtained by reading an original image *and* image data received from an external unit (as recited in Claim 13).

By the foregoing arrangement, data from disparate sources, such as read image data and image data from an external unit, can be handled integrally in an input job, which facilitates control of the job.

Neither Farrell, et al. nor Asai, et al. discloses or suggests inputting image data obtained by reading an original image *and* image data received from an external unit, as recited in Claim 1, 7, and 13. Therefore, Applicant submits that no *prima facie* case of obviousness had been made.

Moreover, Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill lacks the motivation to combine Farrell, et al. and Asai, et al., because neither reference suggests the advantages of the present invention, such as integrally handling data in an input job from disparate sources.

Applicant submits that the dependent claims are allowable by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims and the additional features each recites.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application are respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our New York office at the address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Collin A. Webb
Registration No. 44,396

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
CAW:ayr
117061 v 1